

NOV 28 2006orney Docket No.: 1087-PROT005011

REMARKS**Status of Claims**

Claims 19 and 29 have been amended. Applicants have added Claim 39. No new matter is added.

Claims 19-20, 22-26 and 29-39 are Allowable

The Office has rejected Claims 19-20 and 22-38, at paragraphs 4 and 5 of the Office Action under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 5,956,493 ("Hewitt"), in view of US Patent No. 5,083,261 ("Wilkie"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

None of the cited references, including Hewitt and Wilkie, disclose or suggest the specific combination of Claim 19. For example, neither Hewitt, nor Wilkie disclose or suggest dynamically adjusting a plurality of priority access values that includes a first priority access value and a second priority access value in response to a user request, where the plurality of priority access values are stored in a control register, as recited in Claim 19. The Office acknowledges that Hewitt does not adjust priority access values in response to a user request. (Office Action, p. 4). Further, in contrast to Claim 19, Wilkie discloses a system in which a user can "dynamically change the interrupt signal from *a particular one* of a plurality of resources so as to have the highest priority." (Wilkie, col. 2, ll. 28-30, emphasis added). Wilkie teaches away from allowing a user to dynamically adjust the relative priorities of multiple functional devices by dynamically adjusting multiple priority access values. For example, Wilkie states that "each of the known fully alterable interrupt priority mechanisms is less than satisfactory in terms of circuit complexity if the user only needs the ability to selectively define the particular one of the several interrupt sources as having the highest priority value." (Wilkie, col. 2, ll. 10-13). Thus, Claim 19 is allowable.

Claims 20, 22-26, and 39, depend from Claim 19, which Applicants have shown to be allowable. Hence, claims 20, 22-26, and 39, are allowable at least by virtue of their dependency from Claim 19.

In addition, the dependent claims provide additional features not found in the cited references. For example, neither Hewitt, nor Wilkie, disclose or suggest dynamically adjusting a granularity of at least one timer of a plurality of timers in response to a user request, where the plurality of timers includes the first counter timer and the second counter timer, as recited in Claim 39. For this additional reason, Claim 39 is allowable.

Further, none of the cited references, including Hewitt and Wilkie, disclose or suggest the specific combination of Claim 29. In particular, neither Hewitt, nor Wilkie, disclose or suggest a control register configured to dynamically adjust a plurality of priority access values that includes a first priority access value and a second priority access value in response to a user request, as recited in Claim 29. As explained previously, Hewitt does not disclose or suggest this feature, and Wilkie teaches away from allowing a user to dynamically adjust the relative priorities of multiple functional devices by dynamically adjusting multiple priority access values. (*See, e.g.,* Wilkie, col. 2, ll. 10-13 and 28-30). Thus, Claim 29 is allowable.

Claims 30-38 depend from Claim 29, which Applicants have shown to be allowable. Hence, Claims 30-38 are allowable.

Claim 21 is Allowable

The Office has rejected Claim 21, at paragraphs 6 and 7 of the Office Action under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hewitt in view of Wilkie, and further in view of “what was well known in the art at the time of applicant’s invention.” (Office Action, p. 14). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claim 21 depends from Claim 19, which Applicants have shown to be allowable. As stated previously, the combination of Hewitt and Wilkie fails to disclose or suggest each and every element of Claim 19. Additionally, the Office has provided no reference supporting its assertion that the state of the art discloses that it would have been obvious to add one to a priority grade value. Further, the state of the art at the time of Applicants’ invention does not disclose those elements of Claim 19 that are not disclosed by Hewitt and Wilkie. Hence, the combination of Hewitt, Wilkie and the state of the art asserted by the Office fails to disclose or suggest at least one element of Claim 21. As a result, Claim 21 is allowable.

NOV 28 2006

Attorney Docket No.: 1087-PROT005011

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider the application and issue a Notice of Allowance for all claims now pending. If, for any reason, the Office is unable to allow the Application on the next Office Action, and believes a telephone interview would be helpful, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney or agent. Unless expressly stated, no changes or amendments to the claims have been made for the purposes of patentability.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees that may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account Number 50-2469.

Respectfully submitted,

11-28-2006
Date

Chad M. Herring
Chad M. Herring, Reg. No. 41,067
Attorney for Applicant(s)
TOLER SCHAFFER, L.L.P.
5000 Plaza On The Lake, Suite 265
Austin, Texas 78746
(512) 327-5515 (phone)
(512) 327-5575 (fax)